

**NTA Graphics, Inc. and Graphic Communications  
International Union, Detroit-Toledo Local 289,  
AFL-CIO-CLC. Case 8-CA-24277**

July 24, 1992

**DECISION AND ORDER**

BY CHAIRMAN STEPHENS AND MEMBERS  
DEVANEY AND RAUDABAUGH

On February 25, 1992, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board issued a complaint and notice of hearing alleging that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the National Labor Relations Act by refusing the Union's request to bargain following the Union's certification in Case 8-RC-13648. (Official notice is taken of the "record" in the representation proceeding as defined in the Board's Rules and Regulations, Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g); *Frontier Hotel*, 265 NLRB 343 (1982).) The Respondent filed its answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations in the complaint.

On June 16, 1992, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On June 18, 1992, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed a response.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

**Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment**

In its answer the Respondent admits its refusal to bargain but attacks the validity of the certification on the basis of the Board's unit determination in the representation proceeding.

All representation issues raised by the Respondent were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding. The Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege any special circumstances that would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that the Respondent has not raised any representation issue that is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941). Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**I. JURISDICTION**

The Respondent, an Ohio corporation with an office and place of business in Toledo, Ohio, has been engaged in high volume lithographic commercial printing. Annually, the Respondent sold and shipped from its facility goods valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to points outside the State of Ohio. We find that the Respondent is an Employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6), and (7) of the Act and that the Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

**II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES**

**A. The Certification**

Following the election held September 25, 1987,<sup>1</sup> the Union was certified on September 9, 1991, as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time press room employees employed by the Employer at its Toledo, Ohio, facility, excluding all clerical employees and all professional employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act and all other employees.

The Union continues to be the exclusive representative under Section 9(a) of the Act.

**B. Refusal to Bargain**

Since January 8, 1992, the Union has requested the Respondent to bargain and since January 15, 1992, the Respondent has refused. We find that this refusal constitutes an unlawful refusal to bargain in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

<sup>1</sup> On October 2, 1987, the Respondent filed objections and on October 22, 1987, the Regional Director issued a Supplemental Decision and Order Directing Hearing on Objections and Challenge Ballots ordering that the issues raised be set for hearing and that the matter be consolidated with an unfair labor practice hearing in Case 8-CA-20167. Thereafter, charges in Case 8-CA-20458 and 8-CA-20732 were consolidated for hearing with the above cases. On October 31, 1989, the administrative law judge found that the Respondent engaged in certain violations of Sec. 8(a)(1) and (3) but found no merit to other 8(a)(1), (3), and (5) allegations. On April 4, 1990, the case was remanded to the administrative law judge for further findings of facts and credibility resolutions. On July 5, 1990, the administrative law judge issued a Supplemental Decision clarifying certain of his credibility findings in the earlier decision.

The parties filed additional exceptions and briefs and on July 31, 1991, the Board issued a Decision and Order, 303 NLRB No. 155, finding that the Respondent violated Sec. 8(a)(1) and (3) and ordering that the unilateral change in shift hours allegation be held in abeyance and that jurisdiction of that issue be retained pending the opening and counting of the challenged ballots in the representation proceeding.

The representation proceeding was severed from the unfair labor practice proceedings and remanded to the Regional Director. A revised tally of ballots was issued and the Union was certified. (See 305 NLRB No. 108.)

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By refusing on and after January 15, 1992, to bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the appropriate unit, the Respondent has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

## REMEDY

Having found that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order it to cease and desist, to bargain on request with the Union and, if an understanding is reached, to embody the understanding in a signed agreement.

To ensure that the employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of the certification as beginning the date the Respondent begins to bargain in good faith with the Union. *Mar-Jac Poultry Co.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), *enfd.* 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied* 379 U.S. 817 (1964); *Burnett Construction Co.*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), *enfd.* 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

## ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, NTA Graphics, Inc., Toledo, Ohio, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

## 1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with Graphic Communications International Union, Detroit-Toledo Local 289, AFL-CIO-CLC, as the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) On request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement:

All full-time and regular part-time press room employees employed by the Employer at its Toledo, Ohio, facility, excluding all clerical employees and all professional employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act and all other employees.

(b) Post at its facility in Toledo, Ohio, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>2</sup> Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 8 after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director in writing within 20 days from the date of this Order what steps the Respondent has taken to comply.

<sup>2</sup> If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

## APPENDIX

## NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

POSTED BY ORDER OF THE

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated the National Labor Relations Act and has ordered us to post and abide by this notice.

We will not refuse to bargain with Graphic Communications International Union, Detroit-Toledo Local 289, AFL-CIO-CLC, as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, on request, bargain with the Union and put in writing and sign any agreement reached on terms and conditions of employment for our employees in the bargaining unit:

All full-time and regular part-time press room employees employed by the Employer at its Toledo, Ohio, facility, excluding all clerical employees and all professional employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act and all other employees.

NTA GRAPHICS, INC.